



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

readers who cannot be expected to correct such mistakes by their own knowledge, this negligence in matters of detail seriously impairs the usefulness of the book.

G. F. MOORE.

A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. By J. B. MAHAFFY. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xiii, 261.)

A History of Egypt under Roman Rule. By J. GRAFTON MILNE, M.A. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. xiii, 262.)

THESE two works form Volumes IV. and V. of Professor Petrie's "collaborated" *History of Egypt*. He himself has written Volumes I. and II. and will, it is hoped, shortly publish Volume III., covering Dynasties XIX.-XXX. Volume VI., dealing with Arabic Egypt, has been assigned to Stanley Lane-Poole. The plan of the series contemplates a student's history, no attempt being made to give a well-rounded and entertaining narrative of the various elements entering into the wonderfully full life of Egypt. The dynastic arrangement is followed and the original materials are either presented in full or in abstract, or are so amply referred to that the student will have little difficulty in finding them.

The plan has been faithfully carried out in the volumes before us, which have fallen into hands admirably fitted for their tasks. Few except special students of the field are aware how our knowledge of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt has been recently enriched and corrected by the discovery, publication and investigation of papyri dating from these periods. Some idea of the amount of work done can be gained by glancing over the voluminous report of books and articles dealing with papyrus literature published within the last five years, made by Viereck in a recent number of Bursian's *Zeitschrift*. The results of these investigations have been to correct chronological errors and clear up doubtful chronological points, to enlarge and rectify estimates of rulers and policies, to throw a veritable flood of light on general, social, religious, economic and political conditions, and to make possible the writing of new chapters of Egyptian history.

These two volumes gather up in admirably workmanlike fashion the tools and the results of this advanced knowledge. Both writers are specialists in their respective fields. Professor Mahaffy has already published (in 1895) a larger work on *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, some parts of which he has incorporated into the present volume. He stands among the foremost workers in the publication and investigation of Graeco-Egyptian papyri.

It must be said that these two chapters of Egyptian history do not have the attraction and importance attaching to the earlier periods. This is certainly the case in respect to Roman Egypt, which can be at the best only the history of a province, even if an important province, of the Roman Empire. Ptolemaic Egypt, also, was not the scene or the

centre of any great movements affecting the world's progress. Outwardly it was one of those fragments succeeding to Alexander's shadowy empire, whose disappearance ushers in one of the dreariest and most complex chapters in the history of antiquity, which even Droysen's genius in his *Geschichte des Hellenismus* has not succeeded in making attractive to a large circle of historical students.

Yet if any of these warring kingdoms should arouse a more than limited human interest, it is Egypt under the Ptolemies. Here for nearly three centuries a single family of kings maintained an orderly and prosperous rule. Here Greek art and literature sought and found shelter and encouragement when faction and bloodshed had driven them from their native land, and, in the famous Museum and Library, produced works, which, if they did not equal those of Greece in its prime, yet continued the succession in no unworthy fashion. Here the Jews found a new home where contact with other literatures led them both to exploit their own and to produce a new philosophy of religion which profoundly influenced succeeding epochs. Nor are the personalities and policies of the rulers insignificant. There were no more skillful monarchs in the ancient world than the Ptolemies. The women of the royal house are especially interesting by reason of their vigor, intellect and personal charm. The wives are deified along with their royal husbands. An Arsinoe was honored all over the Greek world and a Cleopatra vanquished the greatest of the Romans.

A most interesting historical question with respect to Ptolemaic Egypt relates to the character and extent of the Greek influence. On the one hand it is held that the Ptolemies ruled primarily as Greeks, caring little for the Egyptian interests of their subjects, except as such care might tend to increase the revenues which were employed to maintain the rulers in the luxury and magnificence of their Hellenic courts. Greek manners prevailed and Greek religion was fostered. Egypt was a conquered country, governed by an alien dynasty of kings, whose military power and native abilities alone secured their position from generation to generation. But this view, already gravely opposed by weighty evidence, has received its death-blow from the testimony of the papyri, which indicate that the ruler was fairly alive to the necessity of conciliating and attaching to himself his Egyptian subjects, sought in some measure the development of the resources of the native population, and even adjusted himself to the political, religious, and social framework which was immemorially Egyptian. All this Mahaffy brings out very clearly and forcibly. The divinization of the Ptolemies, for example, was thoroughly Egyptian and needs not the explanation from Greek modes of thought. The marriages of brothers and sisters, characteristic of the Ptolemaic régime, are explicable from the same source. The long list of temples built and the many Egyptian inscriptions to the honor of these rulers point in the same direction.

In one respect, indeed, it is probable that Mahaffy has underestimated the Greek influence. He minimizes the extent of the introduction of the Hellenic city-state into Egypt, with the contemptuous remark that the

first Ptolemy "had evidently no taste for those pseudo-Hellenic polities, with their senates and public assemblies, which excite the admiration of so many modern historians." Against the denial of such a polity to Alexandria, on which Mahaffy insists from the negative evidence of the absence of inscriptions, there is to be mentioned the testimony that Augustus abolished the senate of Alexandria, "the most characteristically Hellenic part of the local government," as Milne justly remarks. Indeed, one is tempted to see in this position of Mahaffy only an illustration of his invincible toryism, which displays itself also in his denunciation of the Romans as entering the East for "unlimited plunder" and dealing with Egypt because they were after its "spoil." A similar inclination is suggested by his unlimited appreciation of these Ptolemaic rulers whose policy of "thorough" is quite to his taste, and whose character in several instances he strenuously seeks to rehabilitate even against the testimony of such an authority as Polybius.

Milne's work in his volume on Roman Egypt has much less individuality than Mahaffy's, who is always himself and infuses a good deal of the spirit of the political pamphlet into whatever he writes. But the former has not produced any the worse book on that account. To be sure, the inequality of the amount of information available for different periods makes a connected and detailed narrative impossible. Roman historians were not particularly interested in Egypt. Egypt, as the author aptly says, supplied corn, not men, to Rome. Yet it is not difficult to obtain a satisfying notion of the various epochs and the main lines of development, especially in view of the mass of papyrus material available for purposes of comparison.

So important to Rome was Egypt regarded by Augustus that he took it under his immediate supervision, and to this fact it owed the measure of good government which it enjoyed. For two centuries it had peace and great prosperity. It affords an additional illustration of the fact, constantly overlooked and practically denied by many good historical students, especially by students of church history, that the Empire is not to be judged by the life of the capital and from the court gossip, which is about all that is given in Suetonius and Tacitus, but by the situation and government of the provinces. Egypt was probably happiest under the Emperors Claudius and Nero, the latter of whom is in a decree of an Egyptian district entitled "Agathos Daimon of the world," a phrase which, says Milne, "is probably more than a mere empty formula." But in the beginning of the third century Africa came forward as a grain-producing region in rivalry to Egypt and the latter gradually lost importance and its prosperity declined, until at last, ruined and worthless, it was resigned without a struggle, first to the Persians, and finally to the Arabs. The papyri and inscriptions afford clear and in some periods detailed information concerning the Roman methods of government, the local and provincial organization, the economic conditions and the religious situation throughout these centuries, all of which is brought out in several chapters, with admirable compactness, by the author.

The significance of Roman Egypt in the growth of Christianity will always lend interest to its history. Alexandria was one of the greatest centres of Christian theological thought, where Hebraism and Hellenism were fused into one by the creative spirit of the Gospel. The Nile valley and its surrounding deserts saw the beginnings of Christian monasticism. Egyptian papyri have already yielded to us the Logia, other important Christian documents, and the first Libellus, and it is likely that many documents still more valuable lie beneath its soil, awaiting the zeal of the excavator. One of the most interesting chapters of Milne's book is the discussion of Religion in Egypt under the Romans, the passage from Paganism in its various forms, the crude, passionate animal-worships of im-memorial antiquity, the refined Hellenic idolatry, and the Roman Caesar-worship, to Christianity. Christianity advanced very slowly and transformed Egyptian character very slightly, so that the heathen fanaticism which plundered the Jews differed but little from the Christian fanaticism which murdered Hypatia, while in the upper country the ancient wor-ships that flourished when the Pharaohs were in their glory still drew the majority to their antique shrines.

It remains to say that full references to authorities, admirably selected and clearly reproduced illustrations, and careful indices make these volumes models of their kind.

GEORGE S. GOOD SPEED.

The Revelation of Jesus. A Study of the Primary Sources of Christianity. By GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT, Ph.D., D.D., Pro-fessor in Chicago Theological Seminary. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899. Pp. x, 375.)

THE author of this work has a certain freedom from theological constraint. He is confident of his scientific intentions and asks for no test but the historical. The tone is perhaps over-confident. "We have, in English, but one scientific discussion of the entire subject of the teach-ing of Jesus, so far as I know, and that is a translation of Professor Wendt's work." This is an unfortunate disparagement of the work of other men. Dr. Orello Cone and Arthur Kenyon Rogers have discussed the subject without serious omissions. The seeming brevity of their treatment in comparison with Dr. Gilbert's, as shown by a count of pages, is due to their exclusion of the Fourth Gospel, which Dr. Gil-bert, on the other hand, uses as "an accepted and authoritative writing of the close of the first century." If scientific method rather than ex-haustion of detail is to be considered, it does not appear that Dr. Gilbert is warranted in proudly ignoring them. The first step in science is the distinguishing of things that differ, and Dr. Gilbert has not detected features of the Johannine Gospel which prevent such a co-ordination of it with the Synoptics as is here attempted. Some disparity is indeed ad-mitted, but this is left in the form of mere statement without attempt to define or solve the historical problem involved. This is, at best, an in-complete science.